

## REMARKS

Claims 18 to 20 were rejoined with the elected apparatus and were fully examined for patentability. Claims 1 to 3, 8 to 16 and 18 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryson et al. (US 3,733,947) in view of Belec et al. (US 5,374,044).

Claims 21 and 22 have been added.

Reconsideration of the application based on the following is respectfully requested

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 to 3, 8 to 16 and 18 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryson et al. (US 3,733,947) in view of Belec et al. (US 5,374,044).

Bryson discloses pushers 72 which advance a book to a front knife portion 30b. Front knife portion 30b has a front knife table moved by a four bar linkage. (See Bryson at col. 7, line 59 et seq.)

Belec discloses a backstop 50 with two fingers 52 fixed to an axle. The axle spins via a separate servomotor, so that the entire backstop mechanism can be adjusted with respect to the vacuum drum 30. (See Belec at col. 4, line 64).

Claim 1 recites "a driver configured to move the backstop along an arcuate path in the direction of movement of the sheet material article from a first position out of the path of movement to a second position in the path of movement, the driver being configured to rotate the backstop about an axis in a single angular direction so as to define the arcuate path, the axis being disposed at a movable table of the sheet material article handler." Claim 18 has a similar limitation.

Neither Bryson nor Belec discloses or teaches the axis of the backstop being at the movable table of the sheet material handler as claimed. The axis of the backstop in Belec is clearly well below the vacuum deck 40, and thus even if the two references were somehow combinable (which it is respectfully submitted that they are not), Belec would actually teach away from the claimed limitation. There is also no motivation to provide the backstop of Belec at the front knife table of Bryson.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) thus is respectfully requested.

In addition, claim 8 further recites wherein the driver is configured to move the

backstop along the arcuate path from the first position to the second position as the table is moving in a direction opposite the direction of movement of the sheet material article along the path of movement of the sheet material article.

This claim limitation is not addressed in the office action and neither Bryson nor Belec disclose it.

With further respect to claim 13, claim 13 recites the registration device as recited in claim 1 wherein the driver includes an intermittent drive mechanism configured to move the backstop along the arcuate path in synchronization with the moving of the sheet material article along the path of movement of the sheet material article.

It is noted that the servo motor of Belec is the driver, not an intermediate mechanism.

#### New Claims 21 and 22

New claims 21 and 22 recite that the backstop and the table may be driven by the same driver, as described at [0064] to [0073]. Neither Bryson nor Belec disclose this feature and Belec has a separate drive.

Appl. No. 10/002,015  
Amdt. dated November 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2004

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

William C. Gehris

Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC  
Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights  
485 Seventh Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940